UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,959	03/03/2004	Hal H. Katz	END5011USNP	5088

27777 7590 09/29/2008

PHILIP S. JOHNSON
JOHNSON & JOHNSON
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003

EXAMINER	
KOHARSKI, CHRISTOPHER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3763	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/791,959	KATZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHRISTOPHER D. KOHARSKI	3763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 June 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-15* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *16-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/10/2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Examiner acknowledges the reply filed 6/10/2008 in which claims 16 and 23 were amended. Currently claims 1-24 are pending for examination with claims 1-15

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 16-18 and 23-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Thompson (USPN6,453,195) in view of Dempsey et al. (USPN5,417,222). Thompson discloses a closed loop drug delivery system and remote management thereof.

Regarding claims 16-18 and 23-24, Thompson discloses a method and device for monitoring a patient and delivering at least one drug during a medical procedure (Figure 3) comprising the steps of: in a first location (OR, upper torso) connecting to the patient at least one sensor (238, 240) for monitoring at least one physiological parameter of the patient (col 6, Figure 4); providing a first housing having a first microprocessor-based (10) patient unit having at least one first connection point (236) for receiving input signals from the at least one sensor and at least one second connection point for outputting patient physiological parameters (23); inputting to the first microprocessor-based patient unit physical attributes of the patient; creating a patient record (col 2, ln 50-60, col 8, ln 45-65, col 13, ln 35-50); connecting the at least one second connection point (21) to a second housing having a second microprocessor-based procedure unit (20) and performing a medical procedure (drug delivery) on the patient in a second location (during standard doctors office visit, or ambulation, lower torso) further consisting of the first microprocessor-based patient unit and the second microprocessor-based procedure unit (Figures 1-7) (cols 1-4).

Thompson meets the claim limitations as described above except for the specific locations within a medical treatment facility.

However, Dempsey et al. teaches a mobile telemetry based patient monitoring system.

Regarding claims 16-18 and 23-24, Dempsey et al. teaches a patient monitoring system (Figure 1) that is capable of being attached to a patient after surgery or in intensive care units (col 1, ln 5-35). Dempsey et al. also teaches that the telemetry based system is used to move patient's to lower level step-down units within a hospital (or selected areas of a hospital) to cut costs and use mobile medical care elements (col 1, ln 1-30, Figure 1) and increase patient mobility.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to move the patient using a system of Thompson in order to move the patient to less costly areas of the medical facility and open up more critical beds but still be able to maintain patient monitoring through the telemetry based. The references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Dempsey et al. (cols 1-2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson (USPN6,453,195) in view of Dempsey et al. (USPN5,417,222) in view of Hickle (USPN6,453,195). The modified Thompson meets the claim

limitations as described above except for the IV tube drug delivery device and oxygen therapy.

However, Hickle teaches an apparatus and method for providing conscious patient relief from pain during surgical procedures.

Regarding claims 19-22, Hickle teaches a method for monitoring a patient comprising connecting to the patient a plurality of sensors (12a) for monitoring at least physiological parameter of a patient (col 10, ln 35-55) having at least connection point and receiving signals to a first microprocessor (14) based patient unit and at least one second connection point (connection points between the processors shown in Figure 4A) for outputting patient physiological parameters, creating a patient record through an interface (35) and remote (45) and printer (37), providing a primed drug delivery system (142) in fluid communication with the patient controlled by the second microprocessor (2a) through a second connection points from the primary controller (14) and upon termination of the medical procedure, removing the connection points to the patient and controllers (Figures 1-18). Hickle further discloses the step of providing oxygen to a patient (col 3 ln 50-70 and col 4, ln 1-15), querying a patient for a level of consciousness (col 4, ln 45-55), and the step of the patient activating a response (305) device (col 9) (see summary of invention, Figures 1-23A).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to add the fluid pump and oxygen delivery to aid in a therapeutic drug delivery by a different delivery means for increased control over drug delivery. The references are

analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Hickle (cols 1-2).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher D. Koharski whose telephone number is 571-272-7230. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30am to 2:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Date: 9/24/2008

/Christopher D Koharski/
Examiner, Art Unit 3763

/Nicholas D Lucchesi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3763